

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14, 17, and 26 are the independent claims.

Claims 1 and 14-17 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Initially, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2, 5-7, 9-11, 15, 18, 20-25, and 27-29 recite patentable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. By the present Amendment, Applicants have respectfully maintained these claim in dependent form because it is believed that their respective base claims, for at least the reasons discussed herein, patentably define over the cited art.

Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 14 in view of the Examiner's comments and in a way believed to traverse this rejection. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 12-14, 16, 17, 19, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,805 (Chen et al.). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,829,000 (Huang et al.). It is respectfully submitted that all rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 1, 14 17 and 26 variously recite automatically determining the first alternative word on a list of alternative words as a final, recognized word, if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time.

In addition, claim 26 also recites continuously updating and arranging the list of alternative words in a predetermined order by computing a number of times the first alternative word and the final recognized word match.

Applicants submit that Chen et al. does not teach at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 26 and that Huang et al. does not remedy the deficiency in Chen et al.

By at least the aforementioned features, a number of times a user performs an additional task and psychological pressure placed on the user can be minimized during a speech recognition process, even in a poor speech recognition environment. As a result, increased utility and performance can be realized.

Chen et al. relates to a method and apparatus for error correction in a continuous dictation system and describes functionality in which when text 301 as recognized is displayed, the user can select the "correction" item 303 on the menu bar after selecting the word 304 which needs correcting. Then, on choosing correction, a list of alternative words 305 will appear in a dialog or a tear off menu below the incorrect word 304 (Chen et al., col. 4, lines 25-29). And, as illustrated in, for example, FIG. 7 of Chen et al., the system waits for the user's selection in function block 704. Then, after the user selection, in decision block 705, a determination is made as to whether the user has canceled the selection. Consequently, when the selection is canceled, the system loops back to just before the first step and awaits to receive a string of incorrect words. Conversely, when the selection is not canceled, a determination is made in decision block 706 as to whether correction text has been typed. (Chen et al., col. 7, lines 10-12). Thus, Chen et al. performs an operation opposite to an operation performed in the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 14, 17, and 26, when the user selection has not been changed (i.e., canceled).

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 14, 17, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Huang et al. relates to a method and system for correcting misrecognized spoken words of phrases and is cited for its alleged disclosure of features of claim 4. It is submitted that Huang et al. does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency in the primary citation to Chen et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-4-07

By: Michael E. Kondoudis
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501